

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 2 – 7 and 11 - 13 are pending in the application.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings as they relate to claims 8 – 10.

These claims 8 – 10 have now been cancelled, so that this objection to the drawings is no longer relevant.

The Examiner's objection to claim 7 has been addressed.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 102

Applicant's amended claim 1, now claim 13, states that the oversized member (21), which is adapted to be placed over the existing handle or shaft of an object, has an oval or elliptical cross-sectional shape at any location along its length. In addition, claim 11, which indicates that one end of the oversized member has a greater cross-sectional area than does the remainder of the member, has been clarified to indicate that such remainder has a constant cross-sectional area.

The Examiner has rejected, among others, claims 1 and 11 as being anticipated by either Maraman or Jones. However, it is respectfully submitted that neither of these references can anticipate claims 1 or 11 since they do not teach every element of the claim, and in particular not in as complete detail as is contained in such claims, all as required by MPEP section 2131. For example, Maraman not only does not teach an oval or elliptical cross-sectional shape at any location along the length of (as required by Applicant's new claim 13), but Maraman even appears from all of the drawings to show only a circular cross-sectional shape. With regard to Jones, this reference certainly does not "clearly show the structure which is claimed", as required by MPEP section 2125, and therefore cannot be used to teach Applicant's oval or elliptical cross-sectional shape at any location along the length of

its oversized member. Furthermore, neither reference in any way teaches an end that is larger than the remainder of the member, wherein such remainder has a constant cross-sectional area, as required by Applicant's amended claim 11.

With regard to Applicant's claim 5, which addresses a two-part member, it is respectfully submitted that there is no motivation or suggestion to modify the one-piece grip of Maraman to make a two-piece member.

In view of the foregoing discussion, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the allowability of the pending and amended claims of the present application. In addition, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call from him in order to be able to address any outstanding issues and expedite placement of the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert W. Becker, Reg. 26,255  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

ROBERT W. BECKER & ASSOCIATES  
707 Highway 66 East, Suite B  
Tijeras, New Mexico 87059

Telephone: 505 286 3511  
Telefax: 505 286 3524

RWB:mac

Attachment